PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

(Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

Applicant's or agent's file reference 8940.0033-304	FOR FURTHER ACTION	See item 4 below		
International application No. PCT/US2005/001883	International filing date (day/month/year) 21 January 2005 (21.01.2005)	Priority date (day/month/year) 21 January 2004 (21.01.2004)		
International Patent Classification (8th edition unless older edition indicated) See relevant information in Form PCT/ISA/237				
Applicant FIVE PRIME THERAPEUTICS, INC.				

1.	. This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 bis.1(a).			
2.	This REPORT consists of a total of 9 sheets, including this cover sheet.			
	In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.			
ź.	3. This report contains indications relating to the following items:			
	Box No. I	Basis of the report		
	Box No. II	Priority		
	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability		
	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention		
	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement		
	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited		
	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application		
	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application		
4.		ommunicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority		
		Date of issuance of this report 18 October 2006 (18.10.2006)		

Authorized officer

Simin Baharlou

1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland
Facsimile No. +41 22 338 82 70
e-mail: pt09@wipo.int
Form PCT/IB/373 (January 2004)

The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:		PCT		
see form PCT/ISA/220		WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)		
		Date of mailing (daylmonthlyear) see	form PCT/ISA/210 (second sh	neet)
Applicant's or agent's file reference see form PCT/ISA/220	-	FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below		
	International filing date (d 21.01.2005	(day/month/year) Priority date (day/month/year) 21.01.2004		
International Patent Classification (IPC) or bo INV. C07K16/18 A61P37/02	th national classification a	and IPC		
Applicant FIVE PRIME THERAPEUTICS, INC				•
This opinion contains indication	ns relating to the follo	owing items:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: □ Box No. I Basis of the opinion □ Box No. II Priority □ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability □ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention □ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement □ Box No. VI Certain documents cited □ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application □ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application 2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notifed the International Bureau under Rule 66.1 bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.				
3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.				
Name and mailing address of the ISA:	Date of ∞ this opinio	•	ized Officer	Caches Palentes
European Patent Office D-80298 Munich Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 52365 Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465	see form	10 Rank	in, Robert one No. +49 89 2399-2659	

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/US2005/001883

	•					
	Box N	o. I Basis of the opinion				
1.	With r	With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of:				
		translation of the international application into , which is the language of a translation furnished for the urposes of international search (Rules 12.3(a) and 23.1 (b)).				
2.		egard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and sary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:				
	a. type	e of material:				
		a sequence listing				
		table(s) related to the sequence listing				
	b. forn	nat of material:				
		on paper				
		in electronic form				
	c. time	e of filing/furnishing:				
		contained in the international application as filed.				
		filed together with the international application in electronic form.				
•	- 🗆	furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.				
3.	h C	addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto as been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional opies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as oppropriate, were furnished.				
4.	Additi	onal comments:				
	Box N	lo. Il Priority				
1.	d re	he validity of the priority claim has not been considered because the International Searching Authority oes not have in its possession a copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed or, where equired, a translation of that earlier application. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the ssumption that the relevant date (Rules 43 <i>bis</i> .1 and 64.1) is the claimed priority date.				
2.	h	his opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim as been found invalid (Rules 43 <i>bis</i> .1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international ling date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.				
3.	Additi	onal observations, if necessary:				

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/US2005/001883

	Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability			
	he questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non bylous), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of			
	the entire international application			
×	 claims Nos. 11, 23, 26, 29, 32, 35, 38, 41, 44, 47, 52-77 (completely) 12-22, 24, 25, 27, 28, 30, 31, 33, 34, 36, 37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 45, 46, 50, 51 (incompletely) 			
bed	cause:			
×	the said international application, or the said claims Nos. 13-22, 24, 25, 27, 28, 30, 31, 33, 34, 36, 37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 45, 46, 48, 50, 51 (partially, for reasons of industrial applicability) relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international search (specify):			
	see separate sheet			
	the description, claims or drawings (indicate particular elements below) or said claims Nos. are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (specify):			
	the claims, or said claims Nos. are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed (specify):			
X	no international search report has been established for the whole application or for said claims Nos. 11, 23, 26, 29, 32, 35, 38, 41, 44, 47, 52-77 (completely) 12-22, 24, 25, 27, 28, 30, 31, 33, 34, 36, 37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 45, 46, 50, 51 (incompletely)			
	a meaningful opinion could not be formed without the sequence listing; the applicant did not, within the prescribed time limit:			
	If turnish a sequence listing on paper complying with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions, and such listing was not available to the International Searching Authority in a form and manner acceptable to it.			
	☐ furnish a sequence listing in electronic form complying with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions, and such listing was not available to the International Searching Authority in a form and manner acceptable to it.			
	□ pay the required late furnishing fee for the furnishing of a sequence listing in response to an invitation under Rules 13 <i>ter</i> .1(a) or (b).			
	a meaningful opinion could not be formed without the tables related to the sequence listings; the applicant did not, within the prescribed time limit, furnish such tables in electronic form complying with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions, and such tables were not available to the International Searching Authority in a form and manner acceptable to it.			
	the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in electronic form only, do not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.			
	See Supplemental Box for further details			

	Box	k No. IV	Lack of unity of	invention				
1.								
		□ paid additional fees						
			paid additional fees under protest and, where applicable, the protest fee					
			paid additional fees under protest but the applicable protest fee was not paid					
			not paid additional	fees				
2.	×		nis Authority found that the requirement of unity of invention is not complied with and chose not to invite e applicant to pay additional fees.					
3.	Thi	s Authoi	rity considers that th	e requiren	nent of unit	ry of invention in accordance with Rule 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 is		
		aamalia	d with		•			
		complie		_				
	×	not com	plied with for the foll	owing rea	sons:			
		see se	eparate sheet	•				
4.	Co	nsequer	ntly, this report has b	een estab	olished in re	espect of the following parts of the international application:		
	\boxtimes	□ all parts.						
		☐ the parts relating to claims Nos.						
_		x No. V Iustrial				bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or ns supporting such statement		
1.	Sta	atement						
	No	velty (N))	Yes: No:	Claims Claims	15-17, 19-21, 24, 25, 27, 30, 33, 34, 26, 39, 40. 42, 45 1-10, 12-14, 18, 22, 50, 51		
•	lnv	entive s	tep (IS)	Yes: No:	Claims Claims	1-10, 12-22, 24, 25, 27, 30, 33, 34, 36, 39, 40, 42, 45, 50, 51		
	Ind	lustrial a	applicability (IA)	Yes: No:	Claims Claims	1-10		
2.	Cit	ations a	nd explanations					

see separate sheet

Re Item III.

The specific sequences of claims 11, 23, 26, 29, 32, 35, 38, 41, 44, 47, 49, 52-77 have not, according to PCT Rule 13ter.1.c, not been searched since the Sequence Listing as present in the description does not comply with WIPO Standard ST25 prescribed in the administrative instructions under Rule 5.2. The Sequence Listing has been furnished neither in paper form nor in machine readable form as provided for in the same instructions and the applicant has not remedied the disclosed deficiencies within the time limit fixed in the invitation pursuant to PCT Rule 13ter.1.a.

As these claims have not been searched, they shall not be examined. Claims 12-22, 24, 25, 27, 28, 30, 31, 33, 34, 36, 37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 45, 46, 48, 50, 51 which incorporate the features of the above mentioned non-searched claims were only searched insofar as they did not relate to sequences.

Claims 13-22, 24, 25, 27, 28, 30, 31, 33, 34, 36, 37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 45, 46, 48, 50, 51 relate to subject matter considered by this Authority to be covered by the provisions of Rule 67.1(iv) PCT. Consequently, no opinion will be formulated with respect to the industrial applicability of the subject matter of these claims (Article 34(4)(a)(i) PCT)

Re Item IV.

The separate inventions are considered to be:

Invention 1

1-10, 12-22, 24, 25, 27, 30, 33, 34, 36, 39, 40, 42, 45, 50, 51 (partially)
Relating to compositions or methods of treating disease employing a modulator of LRP4 activity.

Invention 2

28, 37, 48 (completely), 1-10, 12-22, 24, 25, 27, 30, 31, 33, 36, 39, 42, 4345, 50, 51 (partially)

Relating to compositions or methods of treating disease employing a modulator of LRP8 activity.

Invention 3

46 (completely), 1-10, 12, 22, 24, 25, 27, 30, 31, 33, 34, 36, 39, 40, 42, 43, 45, 50, 51.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

International application No.

PCT/US2005/001883

Relating to compositions or methods of treating disease employing a modulator of LRP2 (megalin) activity.

They are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept (Rule 13.1 PCT) for the following reasons:

The problem sought to be solved by the present application is to provide pharmaceutical compositions for the treatment of disease

The applicant solves this problem by providing three solutions, namely antibodies which interfere with the activity of

- 1. LRP4
- 2. LRP8
- 3. LRP2

The common concept linking these separate inventions is that these three gene products are all involved in disease. This concept, however is not new as WO03095678 discloses that bone disease may be treated by administration of an antibody against LRP2. In view of the fact that no other technical features can be acknowledged which, in light of the prior art could be regarded as special technical features, the ISA is of the opinion that there is no single inventive concept underlying the plurality of claimed inventions of the present application in the sense of Rule 13.1 PCT.

However, given the nature of the subject matter, it was possible without undue extra burden to search all three inventions. All three inventions shall therefore be examined.

Re Item V.

For the assessment of the present claims 13-22, 24, 25, 27, 30, 33, 34, 36, 39, 40, 42, 45, 50, 51 on the question whether they are industrially applicable, no unified criteria exist within the PCT Contracting States. The patentability can also be dependent upon the formulation of the claims. The EPO, for example, does not recognise as industrially applicable the subject matter of claims to the use of a compound in medical treatment, but may allow, however, the use of such a compound for the manufacture of a medicament for a new medical treatment.

Cited Documents

Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: WO 03/080103 A (MAX-DELBRUECK-CENTRUM FUER MOLEKULARE MEDIZIN; WILLNOW, THOMAS) 2 October 2003 (2003-10-02)

D2: WO 03/095678 A (CORNISH, JILLIAN,; REID, IAN, REGINALD,; PALMANO, KAY, PATRICIA,; GREY) 20 November 2003 (2003-11-20)

Article 33(2) PCT

The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claims 1-10, 12-14, 18, 22, 50, 51 is not new in the sense of Article 33(2) PCT.

The document D1 discloses the disruption of LRP2 (Megalin) activity as a result of the interaction of a drug with the megalin receptor. Drugs preforming this task may be used in a variety of therapeutic settings (cf page 7, lines 14-25; page 20, lines 14-19; claims). As a consequence of this disclosure, the subject matter of claims 1-3,5,9,10,13,14,18,22, 50 and 51 is not novel (Article 33(2) PCT).

The document D2 discloses the use of antibody antagonists specific for LRP2 in the therapy of various ailments (cf page 2, line 13-25; page 4, lines 1-13; claims 27-44). The subject matter of claims 1, 3-10, 12, 14, 18, 50 and 51 is not new in light of this document)

The subject matter of claims 15-17, 19-21, 24, 25, 27, 28, 30, 31, 33, 34, 36, 37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 45, 46 and 48 is novel with regard to the prior art.

Article 33(3) PCT

For claim 15, the closest prior art is D2, which is described above.

The difference between claim 15 and D2 is that in claim 15, the disease to be treated is psoriasis.

The effect is that the treatment of psoriasis is attained in claim 15.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (SEPARATE SHEET)

International application No.

PCT/US2005/001883

The problem to be solved is to provide a therapy for psoriasis.

The subject matter of claim 15 solves this problem but is not inventive as the applicant does not actually show that he has solved any problem since the application is devoid of any material showing that such a therapy might be feasible. As is this is the case for all of the therapeutic agents referred to in the claims (LRP2, LRP4 & LRP8), the same argumentation applies to the subject matter of claims 16,17, 19-21, 24, 25, 27, 28, 30, 31, 33, 34, 36, 37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 45, 46 and 48 which are not inventive for the same reasoning (Article 33(3) PCT).